



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
PO Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/017,011	12/14/2001	John Feldner	018367-9704	7797

7590 06/13/2003

Casimir F. Laska  
Michael Best & Friedrich LLP  
100 East Wisconsin Avenue  
Milwaukee, WI 53202-4108

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

I.E. DANG D

[REDACTED] ART UNIT

[REDACTED] PAPER NUMBER

2834

DATE MAILED: 06/13/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/017,011	FELDNER ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Dang D Le	<b>Art Unit</b> 2834	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### **Status**

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 April 2003.

2a) This action is **FINAL**.      2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

4) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### **Application Papers**

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.  
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

#### **Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
 \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
 a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

#### **Attachment(s)**

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)      4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)      5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 0303.      6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-23 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 1, 3-7, 9-14 and 16-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hosie in view of Hofmann and further in view of Shiga et al. (4,973,896).

Regarding claim 1, Hosie shows a vehicle with an internal combustion engine (34) comprising an alternator (38) producing a three-phase alternating current and a power circuitry (Figure 5) receiving the three-phase alternating current (through 40) and to controllably generate a single-phase alternating current (through 48).

Hosie does not show the rotor of the alternator (38) being a flywheel. Hosie neither shows an electrical outlet electrically connected to the power circuitry, the electrical outlet being configured to receive the single-phase alternating current and make the single-phase alternating current available for use by an operator.

Hofmann shows the rotor of the alternator being a flywheel (Figures 1 and 2) for the purpose of reducing size.

Shiga et al. show an electrical outlet (19) electrically connected to the power circuitry, the electrical outlet being configured to receive the single-phase alternating current and make the single-phase alternating current available for use by an operator for the purpose of providing electricity to the users.

Since Hosie, Hofmann, and Shiga et al. are all from the same field of endeavor; the purpose disclosed by one inventor would have been recognized in the pertinent art of the others.

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to make the alternator with a flywheel rotor as taught by Hofmann and to include an outlet as taught by Shiga et al. for the purposes discussed above.

Regarding claims 3, 5, 9-12, 16-18, and 21-23, it is noted that Hosie and Hofmann also show all of the limitations of the claimed invention.

Regarding claims 4, 6, 7, 13, 14, 19 and 20, it is noted that Hosie and Hofmann do not clearly show the peak-to-peak voltages. However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to set the peak to peak voltages as claimed, since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

5. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hosie in view of Hofmann, Ruthlein et al., and further in view of Shiga et al.

Regarding claim 2, the vehicle of Hosie modified by Hofmann shows all of the limitations of the claimed invention as discussed above except for the storage device and the outlet.

Ruthlein et al. show the storage device (21) for the purpose of retaining electric energy.

Shiga et al. show the outlet (19) for the purpose of providing electricity to the users.

Since Hosie, Hofmann, Ruthlein et al. and Shiga et al. are all from the same field of endeavor; the purpose disclosed by one inventor would have been recognized in the pertinent art of the others.

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to include a battery as taught by Ruthlein et al. and an outlet as taught by Shiga et al. for the purposes discussed above.

6. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hosie in view of Hofmann, Shiga et al., and further in view of Bengtsson et al.

Regarding claim 8, the vehicle of Hosie modified by Hofmann and Shiga et al. shows all of the limitations of the claimed invention as discussed above except for the core including a plurality of teeth, the total number of teeth being represented by (x) where (x) is an integer, wherein the plurality of wires are disposed on (n) teeth where (n) is an integer less than (x), and wherein the low-voltage wire is disposed on (x - n) teeth.

Bengtsson et al. show the core including a plurality of teeth, the total number of teeth being represented by (x) where (x) is an integer, wherein the plurality of wires are disposed on (n) teeth where (n) is an integer less than (x), and wherein the low-voltage wire is disposed on (x - n) teeth for the purpose of providing dual voltages.

Since Hosie, Hofmann, Shiga et al. and Bengtsson et al. are all from the same field of endeavor; the purpose disclosed by one inventor would have been recognized in the pertinent art of the others.

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to dispose low-voltage wire on a number of teeth of the stator core as taught by Bengtsson et al. for the purpose discussed above.

7. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hosie in view of Hofmann and Shiga et al., as applied to claim 10 above, and further in view of Scott et al. (5,929,611).

Regarding claim 15, the vehicle of Hosie modified by Hofmann shows all of the limitations of the claimed invention except for the tap winding.

Scott et al. show the tap winding (Figure 7A) for the purpose of making a selectable voltage.

Since Hosie, Hofmann, Shiga et al. and Scott et al. are all from the same field of endeavor; the purpose disclosed by one inventor would have been recognized in the pertinent art of the others.

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to include a tap winding as taught by Scott et al. for the purpose discussed above.

### ***Conclusion***

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

***Information on How to Contact USPTO***

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dang D Le whose telephone number is (703) 305-0156. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nestor Ramirez can be reached on (703) 308-1371. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9318 for regular communications and (703) 872-9319 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1782.

June 12, 2003



DANG LE  
PRIMARY EXAMINER